New England has been found only in northwestern Connecticut. Mr. E. E. Brewster found it in a swampy meadow at 1100 feet elevation in Cornwall in 1879, and it also occurs in a swampy wood-margin in Canaan. Both of the foregoing are species of the northeastern Mississippi basin east of the prairie and the adjacent Alleghenian region, and just reach western New England. They are not, perhaps, strictly calciphiles but our stations for them are in more or less calcareous districts.

Ranunculus longirostris is rare in Vermont and local at Salisbury, Conn. Its New England range is thus similar to that of the two preceding species, but according to the manuals, its general range is much more extended.

Ranunculus delphinifolius is a water plant with scattered stations, not reported from the northern half of Maine and New Hampshire, southern Vermont and Cape Cod. More reports are needed for conclusions.

R. Purshii was discovered by Prof. M. L. Fernald at New Limerick, Aroostook county, Me., and later at Phair in the same region by C. H. Bissell and R. W. Woodward. These are evidently southern limits of a circumpolar species. *R. reptans*, var. *ovalis* is more southerly than the species in its range, but not enough specimens are available for generalization.

Thalictrum dasycarpum is known only in southeastern Connecticut at Franklin (R. W. Woodward) and at Groton (C. B. Graves). The specimen from Milton, Mass., quoted in Rhodora xviii. 168, 1916 was incorrectly determined.

C. H. Knowlton.
W. S. Ripley, Jr.
C. A. Weatherby.

CARDAMINE OLIGOSPERMA AND ITS NEAR ALLIES.

Wilhelm Suksdorf.

In Mr. G. S. Torrey's article "The Varieties of Cardamine oligosperma" (Rhodora 17 p. 156, 1915) my notes on *C. oligosperma* and related forms were quoted. Since that time I have been able to make some further examinations and still believe that these forms should

be treated as species. I venture, therefore, to make the necessary changes, and it may be well to point out at the same time a few errors or inaccuracies that occur in those notes spoken of.

Cardamine lucens (G. S. Torrey) n. comb. *C. oligosperma* var. *lucens* G. S. Torrey, RHODORA 17, p. 157. Leaflets 7–11 (as in *C. oligosperma*); petals very narrowly cuneate or oblanceolate, tapering gradually to the base, 2 mm. long, about twice as long as the calyx; pods 2 cm. long or less, a little over 1 mm. wide, their pedicels 4–14 mm. long or sometimes longer (26 mm.) the lower usually much longer than the upper.

Cardamine bracteata (O. E. Schulz) n. comb. *C. hirsuta* subsp. *oligosperma* var. *bracteata* O. E. Schulz (1903). *C. oligosperma* var. *bracteata* G. S. Torrey, RHODORA 17, p. 157 (1915). Leaves with 3–7 leaflets, the upper pinnately parted rather than pinnate; petals spathulate (as in *C. oligosperma*, but smaller) 2 mm. long, not twice as long as the calyx; pods 2 cm. long or usually shorter, 1.5 mm. wide, the lower on pedicels 4–10 (or 14) mm. long; seeds orbicular with a narrow thin pale margin.

C. oligosperma differs from the other two species by a more abundant (and longer) pubescence which extends to the ovary; by its longer seeds which are 1.5 mm. long and 1 mm. wide; and by larger flowers (3 mm. long) and short pedicels (2–8 mm. long). In all three species the number of seeds is about the same, namely 15–20 or less to a pod; but the seeds being much longer than broad in this species, the pods are often 2.5–3 cm. long.

C. unijuga Rydb. may also be a distinct species if absence of bracts and fewer leaflets are constant characters. According to Rydberg the pods have 8–12 seeds only, but his figure of the plant seems to indicate that there may be more sometimes. This plant appears to be nearest to *C. bracteata*.

Some specimens collected about a shaded spring this season, make it seem probable that my plant referred to *C. oligosperma* var. *unijuga* by Mr. Torrey, may be a shade form of *C. bracteata;* however, further observations may be needed to prove it. The type specimen of *C. bracteata* grew in a sunny place.

At the time my notes were written, nothing was known to me of Mr. Schulz's monograph. My specimen of the plant distributed as true *C. oligosperma* in my sets of 1885 was not then where it belonged in my collection and therefore was not examined. The result was

that I believed it to be the common form (*C. lucens*) whereas it really was part of the type collection of *C. bracteata*. In my own collection this plant is numbered 723 and (503), the latter being a provisional number under which a specimen was sent away for determination. I was not aware of the importance of numbering plants, until distributions had been made for several years and so the numbers were placed on the lists only and not on the plant labels. So it happens that many of the earlier specimens have or should have two different numbers on their labels, one of them in parenthesis. Many specimens received no number at once when collected, but years later, and for that reason mistakes sometimes occur. Thus the number of the plant referred by Mr. Torrey to *C. oligosperma* var. *unijuga*, although collected in 1881, should be 7238 instead of 723, the latter being the proper number of the type collection of *C. bracteata*. When numbering was begun more carefully, it was thought necessary to have a separate set of numbers for each state where collections had been made. This need not cause doubt or confusion where the fact is known. Mistakes cannot always be avoided, but they may be corrected sometimes. A clerical error of little or no consequence occurs in Mr. Torrey's article in the name of a county: Skaminia should be Skamania.

BINGEN, WASHINGTON.

THE FLOWER OF AGALINIS — A CORRECTION.— In the description of the flowers of *Agalinis*, on page 135 of the current volume of RHODORA, two words should be inserted, so that the statement on line 5 shall read: "*around and* between which lines are almost always red-purple spots." The spotting is confined to the anterior side of the corolla, but there frequently, indeed most frequently, lies along the two yellow lines. I regret the oversight which permitted such an error or partial statement of fact; however, as affecting the contrast with *Aureolaria* the point is unimportant. *Agalinis* is still to be distinguished by the elaboration of a very definite color-pattern.

In speaking of the two lines as "yellow," allusion is made to the color pigment present, not to its intensity. Possibly more often the word "yellowish" should be preferred in description. Although